

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants once again note that an acknowledgment of the receipt of the Certified Copy of Japanese Priority Document 2003-093643 (filed March 23, 2004) has not been received. Accordingly, Applicants once again respectfully request that the Examiner indicate the receipt of this document by checking the appropriate box on the next communication with Applicants.

With regard to the Examiner's objection to Claim 3, there should be no punctuation after the term --intersecting-- in line 3 of this claim. Applicants believe that the Examiner may have misinterpreted a copy machine mark (or other type of mark) on his copy of the application for a period. Regardless, the version of Claim 3 presented with this amendment correctly contains no punctuation after the term --intersecting--. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,791,256 to Nishizawa et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Nishizawa et al. reference fails to disclose all of the features of the present invention. More specifically, the Nishizawa et al. reference fails to disclose a display device including two substrates, in which the first substrate includes a plurality of light emitting elements thereon, and the second substrate includes thereon a circuit for controlling the light emitting elements, as defined in independent Claims 1 and 3. Further, the Nishizawa et al. reference also fails to disclose a

method of making a display device including the steps of forming light emitting elements on one substrate and forming switching elements on a second substrate, as defined in independent Claim 12. Nor does the Nishizawa et al. reference disclose a method of making a display device including the steps of forming light emitting elements and switching circuits on one substrate and forming a circuit connected to the switching elements on a second substrate, as defined in independent Claim 13.

One example of an embodiment of the present invention of Claim 1 is shown in Applicants' Figure 1, which includes a first substrate 50 with a plurality of light emitting elements defined by layers 52-60 and a second substrate 10 including a circuit for controlling the light emitting elements. In the Figure 1 embodiment, the circuit includes a thin film transistor (TFT), or switching element, defined by components 14-22. As can be seen in Figure 1, the light emitting element (layers 52-60) is on a different substrate than the circuit, which in this embodiment includes layers 14-22. In other embodiments of the invention defined by Claim 1, the circuit may include different components other than the switching elements (such as circuits 88 of Figures 6 and 9), but these circuits are always formed on a different substrate from the substrate that the light emitting elements (EL) are formed on.

In contrast, in the device of the Nishizawa et al. reference, both the light emitting elements and the circuits that control them appear to be formed on the same substrate. For example, Figure 20 of the Nishizawa et al. reference shows that the light emitting elements (including layers AD, SD, OLE and CD) and the TFT that controls the light emitting elements (where the TFT includes layers PSI, GL, and SD) are both formed on

the same substrate (substrate SUB1). Thus, in the device of Nishizawa et al., the switching elements (TFT's) are not formed on a different substrate than the light emitting elements. Nor does the Nishizawa et al. reference show any other circuits for controlling the light emitting elements being formed on the other substrate (i.e., SUB2) from the substrate upon which the light emitting elements are formed (i.e., SUB1). Thus, as all of the features of Claim 1 are not satisfied, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §102(e) rejection of Claim 1 and associated dependent Claims 2 and 8-11.

With regard to independent Claim 3, this claim also defines a similar feature to that recited in Claim 1, namely that there is a circuit for controlling the plurality of light emitting elements formed on a substrate different from the substrate upon which the light emitting elements are formed. However, this claim also recites that the scan lines, the bus lines and the switching elements also formed on the same substrate as the light emitting elements. Applicants' Figures 6 and 9 show two examples of embodiments that satisfy independent Claim 3. As can be seen in Figures 6 and 9, circuits 88, which are used for controlling the light emitting elements EL, are located on the second substrate (80) while the data bus lines 72, the scan bus lines 74, the TFTs and the light emitting elements EL are all located on the first substrate 70. As mentioned above, the devices of the Nishizawa et al. reference appear to lack the claimed circuit for controlling the plurality of light emitting elements that is located on a different substrate than the light emitting elements. Instead, in the devices of the Nishizawa et al., the light emitting elements and the circuits that control them appear to be located on the same substrate. Accordingly, for at least this reason,

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §102(e) rejection of independent Claim 3 and associated dependent Claims 4-7.


With regard to independent Claim 12, the Nishizawa et al. reference fails to disclose a method of making a display device in which the light emitting elements are formed on one substrate and the switching elements are formed on the other substrate, as discussed above when responding to the rejection of Claim 1. With regard to independent Claim 13, the Nishizawa et al. reference fails to disclose a method of making a display device in which the light emitting elements and the switching elements are formed on one substrate and a prescribed circuit connected to the switching elements is formed on the other substrate, as discussed above when responding to the rejection of Claim 3. Accordingly, as all of the features of independent Claims 12 and 13 are not disclosed in the Nishizawa et al. reference, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §102(e) rejection of independent Claims 12 and 13 and associated dependent Claims 14 and 15.

Finally, Applicants have also added new dependent Claims 16-19, and respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to their associated independent claims.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

James K. Folker
Registration No. 37,538

March 17, 2006
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\1111\7012719X2749.DOC